

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

CEATS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORBITZ WORLDWIDE, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:13-cv-01385-MMD-PAL

ORDER

Before the court are the following motions:

1. Plaintiff CEATS, INC.'s Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Orbitz Worldwide, Inc., and Orbitz LLC (Dkt. #101). The court has considered the Motion, Orbitz's Opposition (Dkt. #117), Plaintiff's Reply (Dkt. #128) and Orbitz's Surreply (Dkt. #134);

2. Motion to Seal Orbitz's Motion to Compel CEATS to Provide Adequate Responses to Non-Infringement Contentions (Dkt. #109);

3. Orbitz's Motion to Compel CEATS to Provide Adequate Responses to Non-Infringement Contentions (Dkt. #110 - Sealed; #111 - Redacted). The court has considered the Motions, Plaintiff's Opposition (Dkt. #130), Orbitz's Reply (Dkt. #133);

4. Orbitz's Renewed Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of its Motion to Transfer Venue (Dkt. #120). The court has considered the Motion, Plaintiff's Opposition (Dkt. #137), and Orbitz's Reply (Dkt. #138).

Additionally, the court heard oral argument on both motions to compel, and the renewed motion to stay on Thursday, May 15, 2014, at 10:30 a.m. Jared Bunker appeared on behalf of Plaintiff. Allen Wilt and Carl Bruce appeared in person, and Britnee Reamy appeared telephonically on behalf of Defendants. Having reviewed and considered the moving and responsive papers and the arguments of counsel,

1. CEATS' Motion to Compel Discovery (Dkt. #101) is **DENIED** without prejudice, CEATS having withdrawn its request to compel answers to interrogatories, and modified its request to compel production of documents in its reply brief. A motion for leave to amend the complaint is under submission to the district judge. The discovery CEATS seeks, as narrowed in its reply brief is related to the motion to amend the complaint.


2. The Motion to Seal (Dkt. #109) is **GRANTED**. Orbitz seeks only to seal limited information in an exhibit which has been disclosed on a “Highly Confidential – Attorney’s Eyes Only” basis, and filed its motion, redacted, of this limited information in the public record. The Court finds Orbitz has met its burden of overcoming the presumption in favor of public access with respect to this limited, redacted information.

3. Orbitz's Motion to Compel CEATS to Provide Adequate Responses to Non-
 -ment Contentions (Dkt. ##110, 111) is **DENIED**.

4. Orbitz's Renewed Motion to Stay Pending Resolution of its Motion to Transfer (Dkt. #120) is **DENIED**.

5. Orbitz's Motion for Leave to File a Surreply (Dkt. #134) is **GRANTED**, CEATS modified and limited the relief requested in its motion to compel in its reply brief.

DATED this 15th day of May, 2014.


PEGGY A. TEEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE